

Knaus, Thomas; Meister, Dorothee M.; Tulodziecki, Gerhard
**Quality development – professionalization – standards. A mediapedagogy
futurelab**

Knaus, Thomas [Hrsg.]; Meister, Dorothee M. [Hrsg.]; Narr, Kristin [Hrsg.]: *Futurelab Medienpädagogik. Qualitätsentwicklung - Professionalisierung - Standards. München : kopaed 2018, S. 235-258. - (Schriften zur Medienpädagogik; 54)*



Quellenangabe/ Reference:

Knaus, Thomas; Meister, Dorothee M.; Tulodziecki, Gerhard: Quality development – professionalization – standards. A mediapedagogy futurelab - In: Knaus, Thomas [Hrsg.]; Meister, Dorothee M. [Hrsg.]; Narr, Kristin [Hrsg.]: *Futurelab Medienpädagogik. Qualitätsentwicklung - Professionalisierung - Standards. München : kopaed 2018, S. 235-258 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-171926 - DOI: 10.25656/01:17192*

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-171926>

<https://doi.org/10.25656/01:17192>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, veröffentlichen oder widernatürlich nutzen. Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.
This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Schriften zur Medienpädagogik 54

Futurelab Medienpädagogik

Qualitätsentwicklung – Professionalisierung – Standards

Thomas Knaus
Dorothee M. Meister
Kristin Narr (Hrsg.)

kopaed (München)
www.kopaed.de

Schriften zur Medienpädagogik 54

Dem Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend danken wir für die Förderung des vorliegenden Bandes.

Dem Frankfurter Technologiezentrum [:Medien] – FTz/M danken wir für die Finanzierung der Druckkosten sowie personelle Unterstützung beim 34. GMK-Forum Kommunikationskultur.

Herausgeber

Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur
in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (GMK) e. V.

Anschrift

GMK-Geschäftsstelle
Oberstr. 24 a
D-33602 Bielefeld
Fon: +49 (0)521.67788
Fax: +49 (0)521.67729
E-Mail: gmk@medienpaed.de
Webseite: gmk-net.de

Für namentlich gekennzeichnete Beiträge sind die Autor*innen verantwortlich.

Redaktion: Thomas Knaus, Dorothee M. Meister, Kristin Narr, Tanja Kalwar

Lektorat: Tanja Kalwar, Nastasja Müller

Einbandgestaltung und Titelillustration: Katharina Künkel

Druck: Memminger MedienCentrum, Memmingen

© kopaed 2018
Arnulfstraße 205
80634 München
Fon: +49 (0)89.68890098
Fax: +49 (0)89.6891912
E-Mail: info@kopaed.de
Webseite: kopaed.de

ISBN 978-3-86736-554-3
eISBN 978-3-86736-667-0

Inhalt

Thomas Knaus/Dorothee M. Meister/Kristin Narr Ein Futurelab für die Medienpädagogik	9
---	---

1. Konzeptionelle Zugänge

Thomas Knaus/Dorothee M. Meister/Gerhard Tulodziecki Qualitätsentwicklung – Professionalisierung – Standards Thesen aus medienpädagogischer Sicht	23
--	----

Horst Niesyto Under Digital Fire Herausforderungen für die medienpädagogische Professionalisierung	49
--	----

Harald Gapski/Monika Oberle/Walter Stauffer Medienkompetenz als Demokratiekompetenz Herausforderungen für Politik, politische Bildung und Medienbildung	71
---	----

Andreas Büsch Neue Werte braucht das Land?! Die eigene Werthaltung als Grundlage des Arbeitens reflektieren und einbringen	85
--	----

2. Zugänge zur Handlungspraxis

Jörg Kratzsch Aller guten Dinge sind 3: Medienpädagogische Aufträge in der Kita Überlegungen entlang allgemeiner Grundsätze früher (Entwicklungs-)Förderung	103
---	-----

Katja Friedrich	
Qualitätsentwicklung und Professionalisierung gehen nur systemisch	117
Der lange Weg der Medienpädagogik in rheinland-pfälzischen Kitas	
Paul Bartsch/Horst Sulewski	
Medienbildung goes Lehrerbildung	133
Qualifizierung der Lehrenden als zentrale Stellschraube bei der Etablierung der Medienbildung in der Schule	
Guido Bröckling/Niels Brüggem	
Wie verändert die zunehmende Zusammenarbeit mit Schule die außerschulische Medienpädagogik?	151
Selbstverständnis und Ziele in Bildungspartnerschaften zur Medienbildung	
Anne Haage/Nadja Zaynel	
Medienpädagogische Qualität bedeutet, alle zu berücksichtigen	167
Erkenntnisse aus der Forschung zu Mediennutzung, Medienkompetenz und -bildung von Menschen mit Beeinträchtigungen	
Ida Pöttinger	
Tell Me Why	181
Gründe für die Mitgliedschaft bei der International Association for Media Education – IAME	
Ida Pöttinger	
Auf der Suche nach der Wahrheit	193
Media meets Literacy	
Sektion Medienpädagogik der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft – DGfE	
Orientierungsrahmen für die Entwicklung von Curricula für medienpädagogische Studiengänge und Studienanteile	201

Thomas Knaus/Dorothee M. Meister/Kristin Narr	
Digitalisierung erfordert professionelle medienpädagogische Unterstützung	211
Positionspapier der Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur – GMK	

3. International Contributions

Renee Hobbs	
How Digital Media Alter Concepts of Authority and Expertise	217
Ida Pöttinger	
Tell Me Why	225
Reasons for Membership in the International Association for Media Education – IAME	
Thomas Knaus/Dorothee M. Meister/Gerhard Tulodziecki	
Quality Development – Professionalization – Standards	235
A Mediapedagogy Futurelab	
Autor*innen	259
Abbildungsnachweis	264

Quality Development – Professionalization – Standards

A Mediapedagogy Futurelab

The 2017 Forum on Communication Culture hosted by the Society for Mediapedagogy and Communication Culture (Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur – GMK) is devoted to *quality development* in Mediapedagogy in both research and practice, with a particular focus on issues of *professionalization* and the discussion of *standards*.

This thesis paper contains selected theses, provides supplementary and explanatory notes and is intended to serve as a programmatic text for discussion. It initiates a discussion that is intended first and foremost to serve the ongoing *internal clarification* of important issues related to Mediapedagogy in research and practice. With this aim in mind, it seeks to identify the positions upon which the community can agree, and those which might transpire to be more contentious. At the same time, the theses and their accompanying discussion are a way of helping the Society for Mediapedagogy and Communication Culture (GMK) to formally determine where it stands on practical and scholarly work being undertaken in Mediapedagogy, thereby enabling it to formulate an official position which it can *represent externally*. Inherent within the discussion is the objective of pinpointing any future *requirements* in the respective fields of practice and research in Mediapedagogy – albeit without claiming to be exhaustive in this respect. In the interests of concision and brevity, the accompanying background to each thesis is dealt with only briefly, without detailed scrutiny of its (often very comprehensive) associated discourse. Accompanying literature references are intended to provide examples of more finely grained and in-depth explanations.

The theses begin with some thoughts on *technology-driven social change* – some call it "digitization" – and its significance for Media Education. Following on from this, we discuss issues related to *qualifications* and the *professionalization* of Mediapedagogy in practice; we also examine the role of Mediapedagogy as a scholarly activity, and conclude with the importance of *standards* as points of orientation and initiators of debate.

On Technology-Induced Social Change and its Significance for Media Literacy, Media Education and Mediapedagogical Competence

"Digitization" is bringing (r)evolutionary change to our life-worlds ("Lebenswelten") and to society as a whole. Technologically-induced innovation is making itself felt in a number of socially relevant fields such as communication and culture, work and the economy, politics and democracy, opinion formation and freedom of expression. The opportunities and risks it presents pose just as much of a challenge for every individual man and woman as they do for educational institutions and educational policy-makers – especially if the "socially empowered subject" ("gesellschaftlich handlungsfähiges Subjekt", Hurrelmann 2002: 111) is to remain at the heart of democratic society. Increasingly, there is a sense that everyone should be able to take the phenomena which are driving social change and order them, make sense of them, rank their importance and master them.

Mediatization and its digital infrastructure are key to this happening (cf. Hepp/Krotz 2012; Krotz 2016) because media are the most tangible manifestations of digital devices and applications which children, young people and adults come into contact with every day (cf. Knaus 2017c). For people to be able to meet the challenges arising out of them, it is crucial to use educational processes to *foster Media Literacy*. For educators and teachers to be able to accomplish this, they required *Mediapedagogical Competence* (cf. Blömeke 2000; Tulodziecki 2012). In a society experiencing rapid change through digitization and mediatization, equipping educators and teachers with Mediapedagogical Competence is an important aspect of mediapedagogical work because it promotes quality development. Quality development work covers the full spectrum of mediapedagogical activities. These activities cover a wide range of pedagogical contexts and institutions including pre-school education, school education, vocational education, extracurricular activities for children and adolescents, adult education and third age education. In the light of these considerations, we have compiled the following theses:

Thesis 1: The ongoing **digitization and mediatization of people's everyday lives and life-worlds ("Lebenswelten")** and their resultant social change are placing ever-more and ever-greater demands on people's Media Literacy and on Media Education.

Media Literacy should be understood as an assortment of abilities, skills and concepts that enable people to engage appropriately, autonomously, creatively and responsibly as citizens in a digitized and mediatized world (cf. The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs | Kultusministerkonferenz – KMK 2012; The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs | Kultusministerkonferenz – KMK 2016). From a societal perspective, this kind of engagement requires people to be furnished with the ability to both *analyze* and *criticize* media. It is therefore necessary to use media *and* cultural studies in competence-oriented approaches to media in the light of the challenges currently arising from digitization, and its associated economic and political interests: These include the (algorithmic) processing of people's personal data and the new options for social control that goes with it, and the acceleration of everyday and work-related processes with their potential to influence people's focus (cf. Aßmann/Brüggen/Dander/Gapski/Sieben/Tillmann/Zorn 2016; Iske 2016; Knaus 2017a; Knaus 2017c; Niesyto 2016; Niesyto 2017b). Other problems include the manipulation of opinion formation and the increasing number of interfaces between humans and machines, with their associated anthropological, social and ethical issues (cf. Damberger 2018; Knaus/Engel 2019; Niesyto 2017a). Against this background, Media Literacy is – in a broad sense – an important objective for all educational processes (cf. i. a. Tulodziecki 2015; Knaus 2017a). Indeed, this view has become well-established in mediapedagogical thinking. It was first taken up by Dieter Baacke (1997), who differentiated between four dimensions of Media Literacy – *Critical Media Literacy* ("Medienkritik"), *Media Knowledge* ("Medienkunde"), *Using Media* ("Mediennutzung") and *Creating Media* ("Mediengestaltung") – a perspective which has since been refined or refocused in numerous strands of mediapedagogical research (cf. i. a. Aufenanger 1997; Tulodziecki 1997; Groeben 2002; Schorb 2005). From the first decade of the 21st century onwards, discussions on this subject have been held under the heading of *Media Education* ("Medienbildung"). Here, the focus is essentially on education being about people's ability to reference, comprehend and make use of new information, something which requires them to acquire knowledge on the one hand, and on the other hand be able to deal with contingency, to refocus, to actively exploit

new experiential spaces and be open to the unfamiliar (cf. Jörisen/Marotzki 2009). However, Media Literacy and Media Education therefore differ from one another in a number of ways (cf. i. a. Iske 2015).

In the following, we proceed from the premise that the term *Media Literacy* can be used to describe the core elements and aims of mediapedagogical practice, while the term *Media Education* is to be understood as an essentially open process within which people strive to achieve certain levels of competence (cf. Tulodziecki 2010).

If we take Media Education at school as an example, an inclusive understanding of Media Literacy should not only focus on media-based teaching and learning ("Mediendidaktik"), but also learning *about* media. The latter has come to occupy a dominant position primarily in activity-oriented learning and extracurricular media projects in programs for children and adolescents, and such projects are particularly good at bringing out the creative potential of digital media (cf. i. a. Knaus 2017a). In the light of the upheavals brought about by mediatization and digitization, there is a growing imperative to follow Mediapedagogy's call for all school children to have access to Media Education and to learn *about* media (cf. i. a. Knaus 2016; 2017a). This makes it all the more important for schools to offer children and adolescents the possibility to participate in mediapedagogical projects using media in an active and creative manner based on the principles of activity-oriented learning (cf. i. a. Schorb 1995). In this way, digital media can at the same time function as a link between the life-worlds ("Lebenswelten") of the students and the topics they deal with at school. Although the culture in school differs fundamentally from the programs provided by youth work, the right kind of link between them would not only reinforce the role of the school as a place to be ("Lebensraum"), but would potentially give rise to new opportunities for combining "real-world" experiences with school work (cf. Niesyto 2004; Knaus 2017c).

The systematic pursuit of Media Literacy in its full breadth makes it necessary to compile attainment targets not only for schools, but also for other phases of education. These could then serve as the basis for teaching Media Literacy as a long-term process of Media Education throughout people's entire education (cf. i. a. KBoM 2011; Niesyto 2016; GMK-FG Kita 2017). This would also help to counterbalance educational disadvantage and counteract the development of a *Second-Level Digital Divide* (Niesyto/Moser 2009; Moser 2010; Knaus 2013).

Thesis 2: In addition to working with topics relevant to Media Literacy and Media Education, attention should also be paid to the basic technological knowledge – a Computer Literacy and “Computational Thinking” – which contribute to people’s **understanding of digitization (“Digital Literacy”)**, its technical applications, technology and its media manifestations.

Digital technology is more than just a “mediator”: it also creates media content and artifacts, influences human communication, and is becoming increasingly able to engage in independent interpretation. Acquiring an understanding of the technical and structural conditions that generate knowledge and media is therefore becoming an increasingly important aspect of Media Literacy (cf. Knaus 2017b). It would therefore be desirable for people to possess at least a basic knowledge of the technology, the algorithms that make it work, and general processes underlying the generation and reproduction of data, information and knowledge (“Digital Literacy”). Only those who possess the knowledge to understand what is happening “behind” the user interface – behind the face of the machine – are in a position to be competent recipients of information and confident communicators (cf. Knaus 2017b). It is for these reasons that extensive Media Literacy should include at least a conceptual understanding of Computational Thinking, technology and Computer Literacy: one might call it “Digital Literacy”.

These considerations could certainly serve as the bedrock for expanding the scope of Media Literacy and Media Education. It would be desirable for any expansion of these fields to include the following areas (cf. Tulodziecki 2017a):

- *The media landscape and its digital infrastructure* (including types of media and IT systems, media services and access, data and information),
- *the creative potential of media* (including symbols and their meaning, the potential of media creation and modes of interaction),
- *the production of media messages* (including entering and transmitting material as technical processes, processing and editing data, machine-based generation of media communication),
- *the influence of media on the individual and society* (including concepts of reality, emotions, behavioral patterns and value concepts, and their significance for social relations),
- *the conditions underlying media production and media distribution* (technical, legal, economic, institutional and social conditions).

In the face of the social challenges currently being posed by digitization, any attempts to broaden the scope of Media Education currently tend to

focus on the potential role of technical-design disciplines, foremost among them the field of Informatics and Information Technology (cf. i. a. Knaus 2017b). But even in taking into account any laudable attempts to forge collaborations between these technical disciplines, it should not be overlooked that Media Education must maintain its existing links with other disciplines as well. These include disciplines in the fields of *linguistics* (as the basis for expanding the concept of text), *social sciences* (with respect to media influence and the social conditions underlying media production and media distribution) and the *creative arts*, for instance in the aesthetic design of media artifacts (cf. Tulodziecki/Herzig/Grafe 2010). These links reflect the fact that – under the influence of digitization and technical networks – images and moving images (such as film and video) not only continue to be important, but that they are actually gaining in importance as a means of expression and communication. The ability to critically analyze images and films – the field of *Visual Education* – is and remains a key aspect of Media-pedagogy (cf. i. a. Knaus 2009; Niesyto 2017a).

Thesis 3: The increased and *extended* demands on people's Media Literacy (as an objective) and their Media Education (as a process) require – together with the ongoing development of new approaches to mediapedagogical practice – considerable energy to be invested in **improving mediapedagogical skills** for *all* teaching and educational professionals in early childhood education, at school, universities, in further education and continuing education.

Mediapedagogical Competence extends beyond Media Literacy itself and can be described as the *knowledge* and *expertise* required by people in the education and teaching professions – in combination with their professional ethics – to enable them to equip potential target groups with Media Literacy. First and foremost, Mediapedagogical Competence means that teachers are media literate themselves and also possess the following skills: (a) the ability to grasp the significance of digitization and mediatization for children, adolescents and adults in the societal context and to factor it in to mediapedagogical practice; (b) to analyze and select appropriate media for media-based teaching and learning in a (digital) learning environment, or to create media independently and to use them in a way that promotes learning; (c) to take on educational and mentoring tasks related to digitization and mediatization; (d) to plan, teach and evaluate projects or teaching units to foster learning about media; and (e) to work on enhancing institutional frameworks for mediapedagogical practice (cf. Tulodziecki 2017b).

School education, further education and continuing education – insofar as they aim to promote Mediapedagogical Competence – must cover the full breadth of mediapedagogical practice. On the one hand, this broad range of pedagogical activities might be to inform and advise, to stimulate and support, to guard and protect, to teach and mold, to diagnose and foster, and to evaluate and innovate. On the other hand, it includes the manifold institutions and organizations in which mediapedagogical work takes place or in which it is appropriate to provide mediapedagogical programs to their intended target groups. After all, mediapedagogical work in schools is different to pre-school early childhood education or to youth work, for instance. But at the same time, there are certain *antinomies* of mediapedagogical practice in the different institutional contexts, as revealed by the apparent irreconcilability between its power to influence and its desire to foster autonomy, between the understandable need for (child) protection and the need for people to be open to their own media-related experiences, and between restrictive practical constraints and genuinely desirable pedagogical elements (cf. i. a. Helsper 2004; Hugger 2004; Keiner 2010).

The variety of mediapedagogical practice means that school education, higher education, further education and continuing education – parallel to their core content and topics – should focus on mediapedagogical fields of activity. Doing so would make a significant contribution to quality development and quality assurance in the various fields of practice. At the same time, school education, higher education, further education and continuing education should be seen as important steps on the path to professionalizing mediapedagogical practice.

On previous Approaches to Qualification and the Need to professionalize Mediapedagogical Practice

Demand for well-qualified Media Literacy educators is currently growing. Nevertheless, there are still only limited opportunities for acquiring a mediapedagogical education or an academic qualification. Access to a career in Mediapedagogy is often possible only indirectly (cf. i. a. Hugger 2007; Moser 2015). This was reflected in a study of degree programs which provide at least some components in mediapedagogical education. It makes for sobering reading: a mere 51 out of 426 German universities have related professorships or chairs (cf. The German Society for Education – GERA | Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft – DGfE 2017; Federal Statistical Office | Statistisches Bundesamt, undated). The study also shows that graduate studies in Mediapedagogy are possible at very few of these

universities: for the most part, Mediapedagogy is offered as an elective or a specialism within pedagogy programs or Media Studies and Communication Studies programs, with widely differing amounts of time being devoted to them. Even in teacher-training programs, mediapedagogical knowledge is obligatory in only very few German *Länder*. Overall, it is noteworthy that an academic qualification as a Media Literacy educator is only possible as an elective in most teacher-training programs, and that their scope and embeddedness of these courses in the universities is dependent on whether they possess relevant professorships and chairs. It must therefore be assumed that university programs in teaching methodology or educational research, in social education or teacher training, do not as a rule provide students with adequate Mediapedagogical Competence. In the light of this situation, it is highly important that the *Media Education Division* of the German Society for Education (GERA | DGfE) is currently investing considerable energy in designing a *framework for practice* outlining mediapedagogical program components or a complete program of Mediapedagogy itself. This framework reflects current efforts to provide *all* education professionals with *Basic Media Education* (cf. i. a. KBoM 2011; Imort/Niesyto 2014).

It is not only the limited availability of Mediapedagogy courses that leaves much to be desired – even more alarming is the current state of Media Literacy among education professionals: Despite the wide-ranging public discussion about the importance of mediapedagogical early-learning even for children of kindergarten age, it still does not constitute a formal part of teacher-training programs (cf. Friedrichs-Liesenkötter/Meister 2016). Even in other vocational professions such as the therapeutic professions (social care work, geriatric nursing, social therapy or occupational therapy), mediapedagogical knowledge might constitute a useful part of any training and degree program. However, there is still no indication that it is likely to be included in the education and training curricula of these professions at any point in the near future.

Because Mediapedagogy has yet to be truly embedded in teacher-training and other education-related programs, considerable hope is being placed in *further education* and *continuing education*. However, reality suggests that whilst some mediapedagogical further and continuing education programs are being offered by public as well as private institutions – for example by the state media authorities ("Landesmedienanstalten") and the GMK (The Association for Media Education and Communication Culture | Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur) – those programs that *are* available are still a long way from covering all relevant

needs and requirements. Furthermore, there is still no generally accepted method of *certification* and no *hallmark of quality*; there is neither a systematic approach to advancing the development of ideas, nor to evaluating or disseminating them (cf. Meister 2017).

Added to all of the above is the problem that previous attempts to provide a coordinated approach to Mediapedagogy training and education have assumed that it was sufficient to "teach" mediapedagogical knowledge, skills and abilities and that these could be more or less immediately transferred into practice. Experience has revealed assumptions of this nature to be overly optimistic. Overall, these approaches have focused too little on professional practice, something which enables students to develop their own professional competence, to gain a long-term perspective on their profession, and to participate in the debate on the role of theory versus practice.

Thesis 4: In order to meet the different demands of research and practice, existing efforts to enhance the qualification process with a mind to professionalizing the field should be continued. **Professional competence** means that practitioners are ready and able to engage appropriately, responsibly, and with a theoretical grounding, in their professional lives.

Professional competence means (a) that practitioners are equipped with a theoretical background in mediapedagogical practice, (b) that they are able to bring academic principles to bear in practice, (c) that their work is based on research and (d) they possess additional personality traits that are required to perform their professional tasks.

Professional competence should encompass academic principles and precepts, theoretical approaches and empirical findings, and a knowledge of methodological procedures for conducting research. A framework of pedagogical practice should play a central role in practitioners' ability to apply theoretical knowledge to practical situations on a case-by-case basis. Structurally speaking, research-based pedagogical practice is essentially the interplay between situational circumstances and broadly formulated guidelines. Both of these aspects must be accessed in combination to meet the demands of specific pedagogical situations on a case-by-case basis, culminating in pedagogically responsible decision-making (cf. Combe/Helsper 1996). The important personality traits referred to above can be summarized under the heading of professional ethics, which implies a sense of respect and a feeling of responsibility on the part of the practitioner for children and adolescents and even adult learners. Furthermore, educators

should also be free to express their own experiences with media (cf. i. a. Kommer 2016). Broadly speaking, it is simply not possible to equip practitioners with such a broad range of skills and attitudes in naturally limited courses and programs of study; this must take place over a much longer time period.

Thesis 5: The process of professionalization must be conceived of as a **long-term biographical process** consisting of several developmental stages.

Findings from expertise research describe a practitioner's process of professionalization as their development from *novice* to *expert*. During this process, the practitioner passes through the intermediate phases of being an advanced beginner before reaching competence and attaining proficiency before ultimately reaching the status of expert (cf. Berliner 1994; Neuweg 1999). The main challenge for novices is that whilst they do possess knowledge, it is largely context-less and they have virtually no free cognitive capacity while engaging in pedagogical practice to undertake analyses in real occupational situations and use them as a basis for their decision-finding. They only acquire this skill through experience; this in turn allows them to achieve *competence* (although the term is used in a narrower sense here than in our discussion above). Practitioners achieving *proficiency* (according to the development model) are able to react to situational events and take appropriate action in response – deviating from their planning where necessary. They will also develop situationally appropriate routines. As they become more proficient, they become better at organizing their knowledge to suit situations as they arise, and are increasingly capable of and skilled at accessing it. As *experts*, they are able to carry out analyses and take decisions in many diverse situations which are both responsible and relevant to each case – both before and during a situation, and then afterwards in a period of reflection and review.

In the context of these developments, different viewpoints on the way in which theory and practice interact play are key.

Thesis 6: In the face of simplified assumptions regarding the application of research findings, efforts to increase the level of professionalism should not lose sight of the fact that the **relationship between theory and practice** should be conceived of as the case-by-case nexus between practitioners' own conceptions, theoretical principles and empirical evidence.

As noted in the opening remarks above, previous efforts to improve the qualification process in the profession are often based – with respect to the relationship between theory and practice – on simplified assumptions. Such simplifications exist both in the principle of *transfer* – the premise that it is possible to simply transfer general theoretical principles into situational practice – as well as the principle of *transformation* – the premise that theoretical principles can be transformed into rules and then simply applied. Both models fall short: Only when those involved in everyday practice understand the relationship between theory and practice (in accordance with thesis 4) as the case-by-case nexus between relevant theories and empirical evidence, and “workaday” theories and subjective interpretations, can simplified and inconsistent workaday theories be changed in the interests of promoting professionalism. Unifying these two approaches should form a constituent part of the reflective processes undertaken by practitioners when analyzing or designing practical situations (cf. i. a. Tulodziecki/Herzig/Blömeke 2017).

At the very least, this requires a willingness on the part of scholarship and practice to engage and communicate with each other so that research findings can be discussed with practitioners in the field, and so that experiences from the field can be tested using theoretical principles – theory and practice would both benefit from this process. At the same time, these considerations also underline the importance of giving current and future mediapedagogical practitioners the opportunity to work with scholarly material in the course of their professional development.

Thesis 7: In light of the manifold challenges posed by mediatization and digitization and the need to professionalize mediapedagogical action, the **research and teaching of Mediapedagogy** for all educational professions must be better represented in vocational education and training, in higher education, in further education and continuing education.

If Mediapedagogy is to find its rightful place in society, then universities and colleges of applied science must do more to incorporate it into their academic curricula. This is important if it is to become established in academic and educational policy discourse. At the same time, this also sets new *standards* for Mediapedagogy as a field of study to be researched and taught in its own right.

Standards of Research and Teaching in Mediapedagogy

Mediapedagogy requires a theoretical basis, empirical research and research principles. Furthermore, mediapedagogical research and theory-formation depend on experience *from* the field if the research and teaching of Mediapedagogy are to be conceived of as emanating *from* the reality of educational processes relevant to media, and also existing *for* this reality in return.

Since the 1960s, Mediapedagogy has become established as a sub-discipline of Educational Science. Here though, the core areas of focus have mostly been issues of teaching and learning *with* media and aspects of media socialization. Over time, however, Media Literacy and Media Education have become established as specialisms in their own right (cf. Tulodziecki 2011). At the same time, research on Mediapedagogy has developed and become more specialized, so that there are now a number of research paradigms (e. g. empirical-analytical, hermeneutic-pragmatic and educational design research; ideological criticism), research approaches (quantitative and qualitative methods), procedures (experiments, surveys, evaluations and action research) and research techniques (e. g. interviews, observation, visual methods and content analysis).

Despite the significant increase in research on Mediapedagogy, it is still highly desirable and necessary for this trend to continue – especially in the face of the social upheavals which technological innovation has left in its wake. The effects of Mediapedagogy research and its desiderata are visible for example in the publication project by the *Qualitative Research Section* (Qualitative Forschung) of the GMK, which set itself the task of collecting innovative approaches and methods for conducting mediapedagogical research by writing reports about recent studies and providing open access to first-hand experience, thereby stimulating debate (cf. A Mediapedagogy Research Workshop | Forschungswerkstatt Medienpädagogik 2017; Knaus 2017; Knaus 2018).

In the light of the above, Mediapedagogy – as a scholarly discipline in need of professionalization, as outlined above – is obliged to explain how it can transfer its ideas and conceptions into practice.

Thesis 8: Mediapedagogy as a scholarly discipline should, in addition to advancing research insights, also make available dispositional and orientational knowledge that might help mediapedagogical practitioners to **reflect upon** and **design educational settings**.

The dispositional and orientational knowledge that mediapedagogical practitioners need should encompass both theoretical and conceptual ideas as well as empirical evidence (see thesis 4). In order for them to be able to gauge the value of empirical evidence and theoretical conceptions, it is also necessary for the practitioners themselves to become proficient in research methodologies. Indeed, these skills could and should help them acquire a *research-oriented* approach to their work. This kind of approach means that practitioners can critically examine and evaluate their *conditions of action* as well as their own actions. From the viewpoint of professionalization, it is therefore desirable that Mediapedagogy sees itself as a *discipline of practice and reflection*.

However, Mediapedagogy does actually have at its disposal a number of theoretical approaches to practice and reflection, albeit without any one "standard theory" or any one broadly accepted theory achieving prominence. Similarly, the state of research is also characterized by methodological diversity (see above and cf. Hartung/Schorb 2014: 7 and 9f.; A Mediapedagogy Research Workshop | Forschungswerkstatt Medienpädagogik 2017). Within this diversity, several approaches with different core theories and research paradigms compete with each other so that Mediapedagogy as a scholarly discipline – mirroring other action-oriented disciplines – has a multi-paradigmatic structure (cf. Kornmesser/Schurz 2014). Whilst having competing approaches within a discipline can be productive and contribute to advances in the field, it does make it harder for practitioners to access research findings which are practically useful. Indeed, it is a challenge to formulate educational theories and create ideas and conceptions in such a way that they can be applied to practical contexts.

Thesis 9: One precondition for making educational theories relevant to practical contexts – despite the paradigmatic structure of Mediapedagogy – is that they are formulated in such a way so as to offer a **point of contact** with workaday theories and pedagogical practitioners' subjective interpretations.

It is fair to assume that practitioners of Mediapedagogy have certain – albeit subjective or rather workaday – ideas and concepts in mind when they engage in the analysis and design of pedagogical situations, and that they use these to produce (intellectual) diagnoses and explanations, to identify their objectives, and develop individual strategies to achieve them (cf. König/Volmer 2008). It is therefore helpful in trying to unite theory and practice if educational theories are formulated in such a way as to make them compatible with workaday and subjective concepts, diagnoses, explanations,

objectives and strategies. However, even in trying to identify points of contact with workaday and subjective constructs, and ideas and conceptions, it remains necessary for practitioners to hone their independent ability to decide – in the interests of their professional development – what research findings are most relevant to which practical requirements and under what conditions. This presents a further challenge for Mediapedagogy.

Thesis 10: Mediapedagogy should intensify its efforts in educational design research, which places the development of **practical and theory-based ideas and conceptions** for mediapedagogical practice and its evaluation at the forefront of its activities.

This type of research puts educational design at the center of the research process. This includes reflecting upon the principles of pedagogical practice, combining theoretical development and empirical testing, and bringing together various different methodological procedures for acquiring new knowledge. By doing this, it should be possible to intensify and strengthen the interplay between theory and practice (cf. Tulodziecki 2014). By assembling a suitable body of materials documenting any relevant developments and evaluations, it should be possible to acquire context-sensitive knowledge which practitioners themselves can choose to use or not depending on how this knowledge overlaps with their own practical experiences. In doing this, research on Mediapedagogy could make a significant contribution to professionalizing activities in the field and to promoting mediapedagogical practice itself.

The Question of Standards for Mediapedagogical Practice at School, Higher Education, Further Education and Continuing Education

Following a number of comparative international studies, such as the *Program for International Student Assessment* (PISA) studies, there have been growing calls for competency standards to be compiled, especially for schools. Since these studies were carried out, learning standards have been compiled for some school subjects – for example German, Math and English. The purpose of these competency and learning standards is primarily to serve as a *point of orientation* and in so doing to provide the basis for evaluating learning “outcomes”. But at the same time, drawing up standards for these subjects also meant that they *increased in importance*. This implied that other topics at school might lose their importance in the eyes

of educational policy-makers or the general public – and by association, also in the minds of teachers and school managers.

With this in mind, it comes as no surprise that there were also calls for *educational standards* to be drawn up for Mediapedagogy. These demands were not only rooted in the concern that the field would be left behind in discussions at the policy level or inside schools themselves. Indeed, schools and administrators themselves also called for better targets to be formulated setting out the educational aims of Mediapedagogy (cf. i. a. Assenmacher 2006; Wagner/Peschke 2006). This resulted in the first efforts to formulate standards for Mediapedagogy (cf. i. a. Moser 2006; Tulodziecki 2007). Overall, this process involved weighing up problems that might be associated with standards, and how standards might sensibly function. Such functions included supporting and encouraging the development of core curricula, conducting reforms, examining issues related to qualifications, and evaluating teaching and learning processes and support programs.

Thesis 11: Standards can serve as a point of **orientation and reflection** for promoting quality development in mediapedagogical practice and professionalization in the context of education, further education and continuing education.

By emphasizing orientation and reflection, our position on standards is at odds with other approaches, which see standards as a way of measuring and managing output. At the same time, however, we still believe that standards can and should be used as *points of orientation and reflection* in the diagnosis of attainment or objectives. One form of diagnosis is the use of evaluations. Diagnoses and evaluations should in our opinion be used primarily to stimulate and initiate (support) programs.

Any discussion of standards should bear in mind that they can be related to different areas, such as attainment targets, processes, institutions or the regulation of systems. As such, it is necessary to differentiate between educational standards, procedural standards, institutional standards and system standards: *educational* standards (sometimes also referred to as person-based standards) indicate a level of attainment that a person should have reached after a particular phase in their education. *Procedural* standards set out the specifications of teaching and learning processes which exist to ensure that educational standards are met, and include case-based and problem-based learning, and directed or self-directed learning. *Institutional* standards set out the conditions that must be met by institutions in which education and training programs take place, and include stipulations

governing personnel or technical equipment, curricula and general organizational matters. *System* standards cover regulations and support mechanisms which are considered necessary to help the institutions reach their educational objectives (cf. Terhart 2002).

Educational standards are foremost among these standards because they serve as a point of orientation for all other standards – the primary aim is after all to ensure that each target group attains its intended educational standard. Put differently, procedural, institutional and system standards should ultimately contribute to creating *favorable background conditions* to help people attain the targets that are set out in the educational standards. In this case, the Mediapedagogy debate centers on educational standards of *Media Literacy* (as the main objective for children, adolescents and adults) and educational standards of *Mediapedagogical Competence* (as the main objective for media educators and teachers at schools, in higher education and further and continuing education).

Thesis 12: Educational standards should be based on explicit **competence models** which are both thoroughly researched and practically relevant.

The development of competence models as *the basis* for educational standards is worth pursuing not least because existing approaches more or less use strings of associative sequences to compile educational standards without a satisfactory level of theoretical grounding – as in a recent strategy paper by The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK – Kultusministerkonferenz) entitled *Education in the Digital World* ("Bildung in der digitalen Welt", cf. KMK 2016). Similar problems occur outside the context of Mediapedagogy, such as in the compilation of educational standards for particular subjects (cf. i. a. Keiner 2010; Niesyto 2016). This is why the *Mediapedagogy* division of the GERA (DGfE) is currently developing – with particular focus on the issue of professionalization – a theoretical and practical competency model as a reference for future Mediapedagogy course components and entire degree programs.

Thesis 13: In principle, it can and should be the case that **standards** – as desirable "states" or situations and instruments of *orientation and reflection* which support quality development and quality assurance – should be **compiled** at all levels: for people, processes, institutions and systems. Here, Mediapedagogy – as a practical and scholarly discipline – has a key role to play.

There are already a number of promising ideas regarding educational standards in Mediapedagogy (see above). These also extend to process characteristics, institutional conditions and system regulation. However, they have only received little attention thus far from educational policy-makers and administrators (cf. i. a. KMK 2016). This is at least to some degree due to the *multiparadigmatic* structure of Mediapedagogy, which on the one hand makes it more difficult for practitioners to access theoretical knowledge (see discussion on this topic in thesis 8), and on the other hand makes it appear to people outside the community that Mediapedagogy is inconsistent in the positions it takes. This means that there is a high risk that complex debates and the apparently inconsistent multiplicity of positions which they generate might be (politically or administratively) *misunderstood* or *functionalized* (cf. i. a. Niesyto 2016). Nevertheless, it is not up to the policy-makers or administrators in the education system to adapt Mediapedagogy's multiparadigmatic discourse to socially relevant issues. Mediapedagogy *itself* is confronted with the task – despite all of the pressures within the discipline from competing approaches – of finding suitable ways of establishing *common positions* at least on its core issues, and communicating them clearly outside the community.

However, this is made all the harder by the fact that it is no longer possible to view current technological developments exclusively from the perspective of Educational Research.

Thesis 14: The complexity of social change – largely brought about by technological and technical innovations – means that future mediapedagogical work should be more **interdisciplinary** and located **within** (international) **networks**.

In order to be able to properly analyze, assess and evaluate the changes which are taking place, it would be helpful and worthwhile to borrow inspiration and approaches from Psychology, Sociology, Law, Philosophy, Informatics, Media Studies and Communication Studies and from subject-specific teaching methodologies. The current challenges confronting education and culture can only be addressed – in our opinion – if there is constructive *cooperation* with other disciplines in an *international discourse*.

From the perspective of mediapedagogical practice, it is not only necessary to network within the scholarly community and with other mediapedagogical institutions, it is also necessary to collaborate and network with colleagues from other educational environments.

Follow up

In view of current and anticipated developments, the theses and observations outlined above reveal how important it is for Mediapedagogy, and therefore also for the Society for Mediapedagogy and Communication Culture (Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur – GMK) – as the professional association and nexus between scholarship and practice – to speak up in defense of the positions its represents. The work in progress in the forum's workshops, in the specialist groups, and the discussions taking place across the forum as a whole should result in a common and durable position which clarifies where Mediapedagogy stands on questions of quality development and professionalization in the field.

Literature

- Assenmacher, Karl-Heinz (2006): Das Hennefer Medienkompetenz Modell HMkM. In: Computer+Unterricht, 16. Jg., Heft 63, 32–33.
- Aßmann, Sandra/Brüggen, Niels/Dander, Valentin/Gapski, Harald/Sieben, Gerda/Tillmann, Angela/Zorn, Isabel (2016): Digitale Datenerhebung und -verwertung als Herausforderung für Medienbildung und Gesellschaft. Ein medienpädagogisches Diskussionspapier zu Big Data und Data Analytics. In: Brüggemann, Marion/Knaus, Thomas/Meister, Dorothee (Hrsg.): Kommunikationskulturen in digitalen Welten. München: kopaed, 131–139.
- Aufenanger, Stefan (1997): Medienpädagogik und Medienkompetenz – eine Bestandsaufnahme. In: Deutscher Bundestag (Hrsg.): Enquete-Kommission Zukunft der Medien in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Medienkompetenz im Informationszeitalter. Bonn, 15–22.
- Baacke, Dieter (1997): Medienpädagogik. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Berliner, David C. (1994): Teacher Expertise. In: Husen, Torsten/Postlethwaite, Thomas N. (Eds.): The International Encyclopedia of Education. Vol. 10, 2nd Edition. London: Pergamon, 6020–6026.
- Blömeke, Sigrid (2000): Medienpädagogische Kompetenz – Theoretische und empirische Fundierung eines zentralen Elements der Lehrerbildung. München: kopaed.
- Combe, Arno/Helsper, Werner (1996): Pädagogische Professionalität – Untersuchungen zum Typus pädagogischen Handelns. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Damberger, Thomas (2018): Mediendidaktik im Digitalzeitalter. In: Knaus, Thomas/Engel, Olga (Hrsg.): Spannungen und Potentiale des Digitalen. Digitaler Wandel in Bildungseinrichtungen (Band 6 der fraMediale-Reihe). München: kopaed, 77–99.

- DGfE – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft, Sektion Medienpädagogik (2017): Studiengänge für Medienpädagogik und Erziehungswissenschaft. Abrufbar unter: gmk-net.de/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/studiengaenge_medienpaedagogik_medienwissenschaften_erziehungswissenschaften.pdf [Stand: 04.10.2018].
- Forschungswerkstatt Medienpädagogik (2017): Projekt – Theorie – Methode. Spektrum medienpädagogischer Forschung – Über das Projekt. Abrufbar unter: forschungswerkstatt-medienpaedagogik.de [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Friedrichs-Liesenkötter, Henrike/Meister, Dorothee M. (2016): Qualifizierung von Erzieherinnen und Erziehern zur frühkindlichen Medienbildung in Kindertagesstätten. In: Lauffer, Jürgen/Röllecke, Renate (Hrsg.): Krippe, Kita, Kinderzimmer – Medienpädagogik von Anfang an – Medienpädagogische Konzepte und Perspektiven. München: kopaed, 54–60.
- GMK-FG Kita (2017): Kinder im Mittelpunkt – Frühe Bildung und Medien gehören zusammen. Positionspapier der GMK-Fachgruppe Kita. Abrufbar unter: gmk-net.de [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Groeben, Norbert (2002): Dimensionen von Medienkompetenz: Deskriptive und normative Aspekte. In: Groeben, Norbert/Hurrelmann, Bettina (Hrsg.): Medienkompetenz. Voraussetzungen, Dimensionen, Funktionen. Weinheim und München: Juventa, 160–197.
- Hartung, Anja/Schorb, Bernd (2014): Methodologie und Methoden medienpädagogischer Forschung. In: Hartung, Anja/Schorb, Bernd/Niesyto, Horst/Moser, Heinz/Grell, Petra (Hrsg.): Methodologie und Methoden medienpädagogischer Forschung (Jahrbuch Medienpädagogik 10), Wiesbaden: VS, 7–24.
- Hepp, Andreas/Krotz, Friedrich (2012): Mediatisierte Welten – Forschungsfelder und Beschreibungsansätze. Zur Einleitung. In: Krotz, Friedrich/Hepp, Andreas (Hrsg.): Mediatisierte Welten. Forschungsfelder und Beschreibungsansätze. Wiesbaden: VS, 7–23.
- Hugger, Kai-Uwe (2004): Was MedienpädagogInnen tun (Vortragsmanuskript). Abrufbar unter: lmz-bw.de/fileadmin/user.../hugger.../hugger_medienpaedagoginnen.pdf [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Hugger, Kai-Uwe (2007): Medienpädagogische Ausbildung und Professionalisierung. In: Sesink, Werner/Kerres, Michael/Moser, Heinz (Hrsg.): Medienpädagogik – Standortbestimmung einer erziehungswissenschaftlichen Disziplin (Jahrbuch Medienpädagogik 6). Wiesbaden: VS, 262–282.
- Hurrelmann, Bettina (2002): Zur historischen und kulturellen Relativität des „gesellschaftlich handlungsfähigen Subjekts“ als normativer Rahmenidee für Medienkompetenz. In: Groeben, Norbert/Hurrelmann, Bettina (Hrsg.): Medienkompetenz – Voraussetzungen, Dimensionen, Funktionen. Weinheim und München: Juventa, 111–126.

- Imort, Peter/Niesyto, Horst (2014): Grundbildung Medien in pädagogischen Studiengängen. München: kopaed.
- Iske, Stefan (2015): Medienbildung. In: von Gross, Friederike/Meister, Dorothee M./Sander, Uwe (Hrsg.): Medienpädagogik – ein Überblick. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa, 247–272.
- Iske, Stefan (2016): Medienbildung im Kontext digitaler Personenprofile. In: Verständig, Dan/Holze, Jens/Biermann, Ralf (Hrsg.): Von der Bildung zur Medienbildung. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 257–280.
- Jörissen, Benjamin/Marotzki, Winfried (2009): Medienbildung – Eine Einführung. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt/UTB.
- KBoM (2011): Bildungspolitische Forderungen. Medienpädagogischer Kongress. Ludwigsburg: Pädagogische Hochschule.
- Keiner, Edwin (2010): Der Qualifikationsrahmen aus professionstheoretischer Perspektive – ein Kommentar zu Diskussionen in der Erziehungswissenschaft. In: Erziehungswissenschaft, 21. Jg., Heft 41, 127–133.
- KMK – Kultusministerkonferenz (2012): Medienbildung in der Schule. Abrufbar unter: kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2012/2012_03_08_Medienbildung.pdf [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- KMK – Kultusministerkonferenz (2016): Bildung in der digitalen Welt. Abrufbar unter: kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/pdf/PresseUndAktuelles/2016/Bildung_digitale_Welt_Webversion.pdf [Stand: 10.12.2016].
- Knaus, Thomas (2009): Kommuniografie – Eine empirische Studie zur Bedeutung von Text und Bild in der digitalen Kommunikation. München: kopaed.
- Knaus, Thomas (2013): Technik stört! Lernen mit digitalen Medien in interaktionistisch-konstruktivistischer Perspektive, In: Knaus, Thomas/Engel, Olga (Hrsg.): fraMediale – digitale Medien in Bildungseinrichtungen (Band 3). München: kopaed, 21–60.
- Knaus, Thomas (2016): digital – medial – egal? In: Brüggemann, Marion/Knaus, Thomas/Meister, Dorothee (Hrsg.): Kommunikationskulturen in digitalen Welten – Konzepte und Strategien der Medienpädagogik und Medienbildung. München: kopaed, 99–130.
- Knaus, Thomas (2017a): Pädagogik des Digitalen. Phänomene – Potentiale – Perspektiven. In: Eder, Sabine/Mikat, Claudia/Tillmann, Angela (Hrsg.): Software takes command. München: kopaed, 49–68.
- Knaus, Thomas (2017b): Verstehen – Vernetzen – Verantworten. Warum Medienbildung und informatische Bildung uns alle angehen und wir sie gemeinsam weiterentwickeln sollten. In: Diethelm, Ira (Hrsg.): Informatische Bildung zum Verstehen und Gestalten der digitalen Welt. Bonn: Gesellschaft für Informatik (LNI – Lecture Notes in Informatics), 31–48.

- Knaus, Thomas (2017c): [Me]nsch – Werkzeug – [I]nteraktion. Theoretisch-konzeptionelle Analysen zur ‚Digitalen Bildung‘ und zur Bedeutung der Medienpädagogik in der nächsten Gesellschaft. In: MedienPädagogik. Themenheft: Digitale Bildung. Medienbezogene Bildungskonzepte für die nächste Gesellschaft, Nr. 31, 1–35. Abrufbar unter: dx.doi.org/10.21240/mpaed/31/2018.03.26.X [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Knaus, Thomas (2017): Forschungswerkstatt Medienpädagogik. Projekt – Theorie – Methode. Band 1. München: kopaed.
- Knaus, Thomas (2018): Forschungswerkstatt Medienpädagogik. Projekt – Theorie – Methode. Band 2. München: kopaed.
- Knaus, Thomas/Engel, Olga (2019): Schnittstellen – Interfaces des Digitalen. Digitaler Wandel in Bildungseinrichtungen (Band 7 der fraMediale-Reihe). München: kopaed [im Entstehen].
- Kommer, Sven (2016): Buch statt Tablet-PC. Warum die digitalen Medien nicht in die Schule kommen – der Faktor LehrerIn. In: Knaus, Thomas/Engel, Olga (Hrsg.): Wi(e)derstände. Digitaler Wandel in Bildungseinrichtungen (Band 5 der fraMediale-Reihe). München: kopaed, 35–46.
- König, Eckard/Volmer, Gerda (2008): Handbuch Systemische Organisationsberatung. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Kornmesser, Stephan/Schurz, Gerhard (2014): Die multiparadigmatische Struktur der Wissenschaften. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Krotz, Friedrich (2016): Wandel von sozialen Beziehungen, Kommunikationskultur und Medienpädagogik. Thesen aus der Perspektive des Mediatisierungsansatzes. In: Brüggemann, Marion/Knaus, Thomas/Meister, Dorothee M. (Hrsg.): Kommunikationskulturen in digitalen Welten. München: kopaed, 19–42.
- Kübler, Hans-Dieter (2014): Ansätze und Methoden medienpädagogischer Forschung. Erträge und Desiderate. In: Hartung, Anja/Schorb, Bernd/Niesyto, Horst/Moser, Heinz/Grell, Petra (Hrsg.): Methodologie und Methoden medienpädagogischer Forschung (Jahrbuch Medienpädagogik 10). Wiesbaden: VS, 27–53.
- Meister, Dorothee M. (2017): Medienpädagogik: Herausforderungen der Digitalisierung. In: Kulturelle Bildung digital – Vermittlungsdomen, ästhetische Praxis und Aus- und Weiterbildung. Dossier 6. Abrufbar unter: kultur-bildet.de [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Moser, Heinz (2000): Einführung in die Medienpädagogik. Aufwachsen im Medienzeitalter. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Moser, Heinz (2006): Standards für die Medienbildung. Schweizer Erfahrungen mit der Entwicklung von Standards. In: Computer+Unterricht, 16. Jg., Heft 63, 16–18 und 49–55.

- Moser, Heinz (2010): Digital Divide in den Zeiten von Web 2.0 und Social Networks. In: Bauer, Petra/Hoffmann, Hannah/Mayrberger, Kerstin (Hrsg.): Fokus Medienpädagogik – Aktuelle Forschungs- und Handlungsfelder. München: kopaed, 135–149.
- Moser, Heinz (2015): Die Medienpädagogik im deutschsprachigen Raum. In: von Gross, Friederike/Meister, Dorothee M./Sander, Uwe (2015): Medienpädagogik – ein Überblick. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa, 13–31.
- Moser, Heinz/Niesyto, Horst (2009): Digital divide – noch aktuell? Eine Diskussion. In: Hoffmann, Bernward/Ulbrich, Hans-Joachim (Hrsg.): Geteilter Bildschirm – getrennte Welten? Konzepte für Pädagogik und Bildung. München: kopaed, 31–41.
- Neuweg, Georg H. (1999): Erfahrungen in der LehrerInnenbildung. Potenziale und Grenzen im Lichte des Dreyfus-Modells. In: Erziehung und Unterricht, Heft 5/6, 363–372.
- Niesyto, Horst (2004): Öffnung von Schule und partnerschaftliche Kooperation. Zur Zusammenarbeit von schulischer und außerschulischer Medienarbeit. In: Pöttinger, Ida/ Schill, Wolfgang/Thiele, Günter (Hrsg.): Medienbildung im Doppelpack. München: kopaed, 39–49.
- Niesyto, Horst (2016): Keine Bildung ohne Medien! – Kritische Medienbildung jenseits funktioneller Vereinnahmung. In: Knaus, Thomas/Engel, Olga (Hrsg.): Wi(e)derstände. Digitaler Wandel in Bildungseinrichtungen (Band 5 der fraMediale-Reihe). München: kopaed, 17–34.
- Niesyto, Horst (2017a): Medienkritik. In: Schorb, Bernd/Hartung-Griemberg, Anja/Dallmann, Christine (Hrsg.): Grundbegriffe Medienpädagogik. München: kopaed, 266–272.
- Niesyto, Horst (2017b): Medienpädagogik und digitaler Kapitalismus. Für die Stärkung einer gesellschafts- und medienkritischen Perspektive. In: MedienPädagogik, Heft 27, 1–29. Abrufbar unter: medienpaed.com/article/view/435 [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Schorb, Bernd (1995): Medienalltag und Handeln. Medienpädagogik in Geschichte, Forschung und Praxis. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Schorb, Bernd (2005): Medienkompetenz. In: Hüther, Jürgen/Schorb, Bernd (Hrsg.): Grundbegriffe Medienpädagogik. München: kopaed, 257–262.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (o. J.): Hochschulen insgesamt. Abrufbar unter: destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/GesellschaftStaat/BildungForschungKultur/Hochschulen/Tabellen/HochschulenHochschularten.html [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Terhart, Ewald (2002): Standards für die Lehrerbildung. Eine Expertise für die Kultusministerkonferenz. Bonn: Sekretariat der KMK.

- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (1997): Medien in Erziehung und Bildung. Grundlagen und Beispiele einer handlungs- und entwicklungsorientierten Medienpädagogik. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2007): Was Schülerinnen und Schüler im Medienbereich wissen und können sollen – Kompetenzmodell und Bildungsstandards für die Medienbildung. In: *medienimpulse*, 15. Jg., Heft 59, 24–35.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2010): Medienkompetenz und/oder Medienbildung? Ein Diskussionsbeitrag. In: *merz*, 54. Jg., Heft 3, 48–53.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2011): Zur Entstehung und Entwicklung zentraler Begriffe bei der pädagogischen Auseinandersetzung mit Medien. In: *MedienPädagogik*, Heft 20, 11–39. Abrufbar unter: medienpaed.com/article/view/393 [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2012): Medienpädagogische Kompetenz und Standards in der Lehrerbildung. In: Renate Schulz-Zander/Eickelmann, Birgit/Moser, Heinz/Niesyto, Horst/Grell, Petra (Hrsg.): *Jahrbuch Medienpädagogik 9*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 271–297.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2014): Medienpädagogische Forschung als gestaltungsorientierte Bildungsforschung vor dem Hintergrund praxis- und theorierelevanter Forschungsansätze in der Erziehungswissenschaft. In: *MedienPädagogik*. Einzelbeiträge 2014. Abrufbar unter: medien-paed.com/article/view/231 [Stand: 12.08.2018].
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2015): Medienkompetenz. In: von Gross, Friederike/Meister, Dorothee M./Sander, Uwe (2015): *Medienpädagogik – ein Überblick*. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa, 194–228.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2017a): Thesen zu einem Curriculum zur Bildung in einer durch Digitalisierung und Mediatisierung beeinflussten Welt. In: *merz*, 61. Jg., Heft 2, 50–56.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard (2017b): Thesen zu einem Rahmenplan für ein Studium der Medienpädagogik. In: *merz*, 61. Jg., Heft 3, 59–65.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard/Herzig, Bardo/Blömeke, Sigrid (2017): *Gestaltung von Unterricht – Eine Einführung in die Didaktik*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt/UTB.
- Tulodziecki, Gerhard/Herzig, Bardo/Grafe, Silke (2010): *Medienbildung in Schule und Unterricht – Grundlagen und Beispiele*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt/UTB.
- Wagner, Wolf-Rüdiger/Peschke, Rudolf (2006): Auf dem Weg zu Bildungsstandards? In: *Computer+Unterricht*, Jg. 16, Heft 63, 6–11.

Selected Further Reading

- Giesecke, Hermann (2010): Pädagogik als Beruf. Grundformen pädagogischen Handelns. Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.
- Helsper, Werner (2004): Pädagogisches Handeln in den Antinomien der Moderne. In: Krüger, Heinz-H./Helsper, Werner (Hrsg.): Einführung in Grundbegriffe und Grundfragen der Erziehungswissenschaft. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, 15–34.
- Helsper, Werner/Tippelt, Rudolf (2011): Ende der Profession und Professionalisierung ohne Ende? Zwischenbilanz einer unabgeschlossenen Diskussion. In: Helsper, Werner/Tippelt, Rudolf (Hrsg.): Pädagogische Professionalität. Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, Beiheft; 57, Weinheim und Basel: Beltz, 268–288.
- Hugger, Kai-Uwe (2001): Medienpädagogik als Profession. Perspektiven für ein neues Selbstverständnis. München: kopaed.
- Neuss, Norbert (2003): Zur Notwendigkeit und Professionalisierung der Medienpädagogik. In: Neuss, Norbert (Hrsg.): Beruf Medienpädagoge. Selbstverständnis – Ausbildung – Ausbildungsfelder. München: kopaed, 9–26.
- Schorb, Bernd (1989): Berufsbild, Berufsfeld, Arbeitsfeld? Was sollen, können und sind Medienpädagogen, wer braucht sie und wer will sie? In: merz, 43. Jg., Heft 1, 46–47.

Autor*innen

Paul Detlev Bartsch

Prof., Dr. phil.; Lehrer (Diplom 1980) für Deutsch und Musik; Literaturwissenschaftler (Promotion 1988); leitete von 1992 bis 2017 den Arbeitsbereich *Medienbildung* am Pädagogischen Landesinstitut LISA des Landes Sachsen-Anhalt, seit 2009 zudem Professor für Erziehungswissenschaft, Kindheit und Medien an der Hochschule Merseburg (Fachbereich Soziale Arbeit.Medien.Kultur); zahlreiche Publikationen zur Medien- und kulturellen Bildung; Mitglied der Länderkonferenz Medienbildung (LKM, bis 2017) sowie der Internationalen Arbeitsgemeinschaft Kommunikation und Medien (IAKM); daneben als Autor, Journalist und Liedermacher aktiv; lebt in Halle (Saale); Web: zirkustiger.de.

Guido Bröckling

Dr.; Magister-Studium der Publizistik- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, Kulturwissenschaft und (Medien-)Psychologie in Münster und Berlin (2000–2007); Promotion an der Universität der Künste Berlin (2007–2012); seit 2017 Projektleiter Büro Berlin des JFF; seit 2014 Geschäftsführer des JFF Berlin-Brandenburg; 2012–2016 wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter und Lehrbeauftragter am Institut für Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft der Universität Leipzig; Interessen- und Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Medienkompetenz- und Aneignungsforschung, Medienkulturtheorie, Mediensoziologie, Theorie-Praxis-Transfer; Sprecher der Landesgruppe Berlin-Brandenburg und der Fachgruppe Außerschulische Medienpädagogik der GMK; Web: jff.de/jff/ansprechpersonen/detail/brckling.

Niels Brüggem

Dr., M. A. Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaften, Informatik und Erziehungswissenschaft; Leiter der Abteilung Forschung des JFF – Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis; zuvor wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter am JFF und an der Professur für Medienpädagogik und Weiterbildung der Universität Leipzig; Arbeitsschwerpunkte: medienpädagogische Evaluationsforschung, Medienaneignungsforschung (insbesondere in Bezug auf digitale Medien), Mediatisierung von Jugendarbeit, Partizipation mit Medien sowie Ästhetik und medienpädagogische Ansätze; Mitglied der merzWissenschaft-Redaktion, der Expertengruppe der EU-Kommission *Digitalisation and Youth* und der Lenkungsgruppe der Initiative KBom; Web: jff.de/jff/ansprechpersonen/detail/niels-brueggen und twitter.com/empaed.

Andreas Büsch

Dipl.-Theologe, Dipl. Pädagoge; Leiter der Clearingstelle Medienkompetenz der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz und Professor für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationswissenschaft im Fachbereich Soziale Arbeit an der Katholischen Hochschule Mainz; Arbeits- und Forschungsschwerpunkte: Kirche und (mediale) Kommunikation, Medienkompetenz-Vermittlung und Medienbildung, Mediensozialisation von Kindern und Jugendlichen, mediengestützte Beratung.

Katja Friedrich

M. A. Literaturwissenschaft; seit 1999 bei der Landeszentrale für Medien und Kommunikation, Rheinland-Pfalz (LMK); dort hat sie die Stabsstelle *Zukunft der Bildung* inne und leitet seit 2006 die 100 Prozent Tochtergesellschaft der LMK medien+bildung.com (m+b.com); seit 2003 nebenberuflich als Gutachterin für das Qualitätstestierungsverfahren LQW tätig und beschäftigt sich intensiv mit dem Thema „Qualitäts- und Organisationsentwicklung von Bildungsorganisationen“, dabei steht die Frage „Wie kann gute Bildung gelingen?“ im Mittelpunkt ihres Interesses.

Harald Gapski

Dr. M. A. (USA); seit 2016 Leiter Forschung zuvor Leiter Grimme Medienbildung (2010–2016) am Grimme-Institut in Marl; arbeitet in Projekten des Grimme-Forschungskollegs an der Universität zu Köln und ist Beiratsmitglied des Center for Advanced Internet Studies (Bochum); war externer Gutachter der EU-Kommission für *Media Literacy*-Projekte (2001) und externer Sachverständiger der Enquete-Kommission *Internet und digitale Gesellschaft* des Deutschen Bundestags (2011); Arbeitsschwerpunkte: Medien- und Informationskompetenzen, Big Data, Medientheorien; Web: grimme-forschung.de/team/t/d/gapski-dr-harald.

Anne Haage

Dipl.-Journalistin; seit 2013 wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Fachbereich Rehabilitationswissenschaft bei JProf. Dr. Ingo Bosse; Promotionsvorhaben zur Teilhabe von Menschen mit Behinderung an der öffentlichen Kommunikation; vorher tätig beim media consulting team als Projektleiterin für medienpädagogische Projekte für Zeitungen und Radio in Schulen und Kitas; aktives Mitglied in der GMK-Fachgruppe *Inklusive Medienbildung*; Web: kme.tu-dortmund.de/cms/de/Startseite/Fachgebiet/Personen/Wissenschaftliche-Mitarbeiterinnen-und-Mitarbeiter/Haage.html.

Renee Hobbs

Prof. Dr.; Professor of Communication Studies at the University of Rhode Island (USA) where she directs the *Media Education Lab*; she is an expert on digital and media literacy education; she offers online and F2F professional development programs for educators, including the URI Graduate Certificate in Digital Literacy; she created a crowdsourced platform, *Mind Over Media: Analyzing Contemporary Propaganda* (mindovermedia.eu) to support global propaganda education; eMail: hobbs@uri.edu; Web: mediaeducationlab.com.

Thomas Knaus

Prof. Dr. phil.; Professor für Erziehungswissenschaft und Leiter der Abteilung Medienpädagogik an der PH Ludwigsburg, Wissenschaftlicher Direktor des FTzM in Frankfurt/Main und Honorarprofessor am Fb Informatik & Ingenieurwissenschaften der Frankfurt UAS; Forschungsschwerpunkte: Medienpädagogik und Bildungsinformatik; Mitglied der DGfE und der GI, engagiert sich im Lenkungskreis von KBoM! und im Bundesvorstand der GMK sowie als Initiator der *fraMediale* und Sprecher der Fachgruppe *Qualitative Forschung*; Web: thomas-knaus.de.

Jörg Kratzsch

M. A. Medienwissenschaftler; seit 2018 Projektleiter für E-Learning am Landesfilmdienst Sachsen für Jugend- und Erwachsenenbildung e. V. (LFD); war Referent für Kinder- und Jugendmedienschutz in der Servicestelle Kinder- und Jugendschutz von fjp>media (2016–2018); seit 2009 im Landesgruppensprecherteam der GMK in Sachsen-Anhalt; seit 2012 im GMK-Fachgruppensprecherteam der Fachgruppe *Kita*; Jugendschutzsachverständiger der FSK seit 2014; Arbeitsschwerpunkte: (seit neuestem) E-Learning, Kinder- und Jugendmedienschutz, Medien in der frühen Kindheit, aktive Medienarbeit.

Dorothee M. Meister

Dr. phil., Diplom-Pädagogin; seit 2004 Professorin für Medienpädagogik und empirische Medienforschung an der kulturwissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Paderborn; war Vorstandsmitglied in der GMK (2007–2013) und der Sektion Medienpädagogik der DGfE (2006–2009), war zwischen 2011 und 2015 Vizepräsidentin für Lehre, Studium und Qualitätsmanagement der Universität Paderborn; ist seit 2015 Ko-Vorsitzende der GMK; Arbeits- und Forschungsschwerpunkte: Digitale Medien in Schule, Weiterbildung und Hochschulbildung, empirische Medienforschung, E-Assessments; Web: kw.uni-paderborn.de/institut-fuer-medienwissenschaften/dm.

Kristin Narr

M. A. Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft/Medienpädagogik; seit 2012 freiberufliche Medienpädagogin; Arbeitsschwerpunkte: offener, kreativer und partizipativer Einsatz und Umgang digitaler Medien, digitale Kinder- und Jugendbeteiligung, Lernen mit digitalen Medien, Making in pädagogischen Zusammenhängen und Open Educational Resources; zu diesen Themen konzipiert sie Workshops, führt Projekte durch, berät Bildungseinrichtungen, schreibt Texte, hält Vorträge und moderiert Veranstaltungen; Herausgeberin des *Handbuchs Making-Aktivitäten mit Kindern und Jugendlichen*; Redaktionsmitglied des *Medienpädagogik Praxisblogs*; seit 2015 Vorstandsmitglied der GMK; Web: kristin-narr.de.

Horst Niesyto

Dr. rer. soc.; Diplompädagoge; hauptberufliche Tätigkeiten in der außerschulischen Jugendarbeit und Jugendbildung (1977–1996); Professor für Erziehungswissenschaft mit dem Schwerpunkt Medienpädagogik an der PH Ludwigsburg (1997–2017); zahlreiche Projekte und Veröffentlichungen zu verschiedenen Themen der Medienpädagogik; (Mit-)Herausgeber mehrerer Schriftenreihen zur Medienpädagogik; Sprecher der Initiative Keine Bildung ohne Medien! (KBoM!) (2009–2014) und Vorsitzender der Sektion Medienpädagogik der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft (2008–2012); Ehrenmitglied der GMK; seit Oktober 2017 im Ruhestand; Web: horst-niesyto.de.

Monika Oberle

Prof. Dr.; seit 2011 Professorin für Politikwissenschaft/Didaktik der Politik an der Universität Göttingen; Vorsitzende der Gesellschaft für Politikdidaktik und politische Jugend- und Erwachsenenbildung (GPJE); Vorstandsmitglied der Gesellschaft für empirische Bildungsforschung (GEBF); Sprecherin der Sektion Politikwissenschaft und Politische Bildung in der Deutschen Vereinigung für Politikwissenschaft (DVPW); Arbeits- und Forschungsschwerpunkte: Empirische Lehr-Lern-Forschung zur politischen Bildung, Politische EU-Bildung, Bildung für Nachhaltige Entwicklung; Web: uni-goettingen.de/de/prof-dr-monika-oberle/265134.html.

Ida Pöttinger

Dr.; Dipl.-Pädagogin; bis November 2015 Vorsitzende der GMK und bis 2014 Referentin an der Landesanstalt für Kommunikation Baden-Württemberg; war an mehreren internationalen Projekten beteiligt; Sprecherin der GMK-Fachgruppe *Global Media Literacy*; Mitbegründerin der *International Association for Media Education* (IAME).

Walter Staufer

Referent bei der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung im Fachbereich Zielgruppenspezifische Angebote; Schwerpunkte: Medienpädagogik, Bildung für die digitale Gesellschaft, inklusiv politisch bilden und Europabildung; vormals Bundesprüfstelle für jugendgefährdende Medien und Dozent an der Zivildienstschule Karlsruhe; Web: bbp.de/medienkompetenz-schriftenreihe.

Horst Sulewski

Lehrer für Deutsch, Politik und Geschichte in Frankfurt am Main; seit drei Jahrzehnten in den Bereichen Medienbildung, Lehrkräfte(fort)bildung und speziell der Filmbildung in verschiedenen hessischen Landesinstituten tätig; Mitglied im Bundesvorstand GMK mit dem Themenschwerpunkt *Medienbildung in der Schule*; Sprecher der GMK-Fachgruppe *Schule*; Mitarbeit in verschiedenen bundesweiten Konzeptentwicklungsgruppen (KMK 2012, LKM, Arbeitskreis Film); Entwicklung und Umsetzung von Fortbildungskonzepten im Bereich der Filmbildung für Multiplikator*innen (z. B. Medienzentrumsleitungen) sowie Lehrende; Bildung von Netzwerkstrukturen zwischen den verschiedenen Akteur*innen der Filmvermittlung in Hessen.

Gerhard Tulodziecki

Prof. Dr.; emeritierter Professor für Allgemeine Didaktik und Medienpädagogik an der Universität Paderborn; entwickelte – nach verschiedenen Arbeiten zur Mediendidaktik – ab 1985 das Konzept einer handlungs- und entwicklungsorientierten Medienpädagogik für die Schule und hat damit zahlreiche konzeptionelle und politische Papiere beeinflusst; Ehrenmitglied der GMK und langjähriges Mitglied in der GMK-Fachgruppe *Schule* sowie der *Sektion Medienpädagogik* der DGfE.

Nadja Zaynel

Dr.; seit Oktober 2017 PIKSL Laborleitung in Düsseldorf; vorher wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Institut für Kommunikationswissenschaft der WWU Münster; Promotion zur Internetnutzung von Jugendlichen und jungen Erwachsenen mit Down-Syndrom; seit 2014 Fachgruppensprecherin der GMK-Fachgruppe *Inklusive Medienbildung* (gemeinsam mit JProf. Dr. Ingo Bosse, JProf. Dr. Anna-Maria Kamin und Elisabeth Hermanns).

Abbildungsnachweis

Titelbild

©Titelcollage: Photodiem+iladm+Vladgrin/shutterstock.com

Thomas Knaus/Dorothee M. Meister/Gerhard Tulodziecki

© GMK/Wedad Coric (Abb. 1, Seite 27)

Horst Niesyto

© Keine Bildung ohne Medien! – KBoM! (Abb. 1 und 2, Seite 51)

Harald Gapski/Monika Oberle/Walter Staufer

© Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung – bpb (Abb. 1, Seite 79)

Andreas Büsch

Eigene Grafik nach Köberer 2015 (Abb. 1, Seite 87)

Katja Friedrich

© Der mec (Abb. 1, Seite 120)

© EMMA (Abb. 2, Seite 125)

© Fortbildungsmodell für Erzieher (Abb. 3, Seite 128)

Paul Bartsch/Horst Sulewski

© Hochschule Merseburg 2015/16 (Abb. 2, Seite 139)

© Hochschule Merseburg 2016 (Abb. 3, Seite 140)

Guido Bröckling/Niels Brügger

Eigene Grafiken (Abb. 1 bis 4, Seiten 155, 156, 158)

Anne Haage/Nadja Zaynel

© MMB16 (Abb. 1, Seite 169)

© ARD/ZDF-Online-Studie 2016 und

Bosse/Hasebrink 2016: 46 (Abb. 2, Seite 171)

Ida Pöttinger

Seiten 181–191, 225–234